



**MCDOWELL SONORAN PRESERVE COMMISSION
GRANITE REEF SENIOR CENTER, ROOM 8
1700 N. GRANITE REEF ROAD
SCOTTSDALE, ARIZONA, 85257
MONDAY, DECEMBER 7, 2009**

MEETING MINUTES

PRESENT:

Gerald Miller, Chair
Howard Myers, Vice-Chair
Carla, Commissioner
BJ Heggli, Commissioner (arrived at 5:07 p.m.)
Rand Hubbell, Commissioner
Deke Joralmon, Commissioner
Fred Klein, Commissioner
Tom Silverman, Commissioner
Susan Wheeler, Commissioner (arrived at 5:07 p.m.)
Linda Whitehead, Commissioner

ABSENT:

Melinda Gulick, Commissioner

STAFF:

Kroy Ekblaw
Bill Murphy
Claire Miller
Scott Hamilton
Brad Carr
Robin Rodgers
Keith Niederer
Rob Chasan

GUESTS:

Mary Manross
Erik Filsinger
Tanya Frieze
Shawn Van Giesen
Jason Rose
Jon Mitchell
Con Englehorn
Joni Millavec
June Klier
Steve Fucello
Tracy Epel

1. **Call to Order**

Chair Miller called the meeting to order at 5:03 p.m.

2. **Roll Call**

A formal roll call confirmed members present as listed above, noting the presence of a quorum.

3. **Moment of Silence**

The Commission observed a moment of silence.

4. **Review and Approval of Minutes**

a) Regular Meeting of November 5, 2009

Commissioner Whitehead noted that the meeting was held at the Granite Reef Senior Center. Vice-Chair Myers corrected the spelling of his name. He clarified that the Planning Committee had a number of "sections" for the Commission to approve, not "questions." Commissioner Heggli added, "in accordance with the work plan," to the last sentence of the fourth paragraph of item 9.

COMMISSIONER HUBBELL MOVED TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 5, 2009 REGULAR MEETING, AS AMENDED. COMMISSIONER JORALMON SECONDED. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY BY A VOTE OF TEN (10) TO ZERO (0).

5. **Public Comment**

Ms. Klier said Take-a-Hike Arizona is a Scottsdale company that offers guided hikes and excursions throughout the Valley. The company has permits to hike in nearly every park in the region, except the Preserve. As a member of the Scottsdale Convention and Visitor's Bureau, the business helps promote Scottsdale to the travel industry. Many visitors to the Valley are uncomfortable hiking by themselves and want a guided experience. Every three days there is a mountain rescue in the Valley, and Take-a-Hike helps people avoid such trouble. She requested that the MSPC create a permit process to allow guided hiking companies access to the Preserve. Visitors prefer to hike close to where they are staying. Having experienced guides operating in the Preserve would be an asset to the City.

6. **Proposed Communication Facility in the Vicinity of the Preserve**

Mr. Niederer provided an overview of an application to the Development Review Board. It is a request by NewPath Network to install two distributed antenna systems (DAS) nodes in close proximity to the Preserve. It is part of an effort by NewPath to construct 287 DAS nodes throughout Scottsdale. One request is for a canister-designed pole on the west side of 124th Street at the Cactus alignment. The second request is on the east side of 128th Street

north of Larkspur. These sites are allowed in the public right-of-way, provided they meet the height of the underlying zoning district. The City is compensated from \$3,011 to \$3,183 annually, depending on the type of the facility used.

In response to an inquiry from Commissioner Wheeler, Mr. Niederer said neither facility would be placed near a horse trail. Commissioner Carla expressed concern that approving this request would open the door to more and bigger facilities in the future. A NewPath representative said the facilities are within the right-of-way, and would not enter the Preserve at all, even during the installation phase. The nodes are fed by buried fiber optics cables that connect to remote equipment. This minimizes the impact the facilities would have on aesthetics. Multiple carriers can operate from the same antenna without requiring additional equipment there in the future. Mr. Niederer noted that any carrier that wished to locate within the Preserve would require a conditional use permit approval from the Planning Commission.

Commissioner Joralmon said the Larkspur site is located next to a multi-use trail, used by equestrians. In response to his inquiries, the NewPath representative said the company consulted with residents of the HOA directly to the east. The monument design was selected for that site because of its proximity to a trailhead. She welcomed alternative suggestions. Mr. Van Giesen explained that he worked with the community to mimic the design aesthetic of Stonegate Mountain. Mr. Mitchell added that the facility would be located about 35 feet to the right of the trail, about 50 yards north of the trailhead.

Commissioner Hubbell inquired about power requirements. Mr. Van Giesen explained that there is a transformer to the south of the road alignment in the right-of-way. A trench was dug to that facility. The power requirements are low enough not to require meters. In response to Commissioner Klein's inquiry, Mr. Van Giesen said maintenance activity is scheduled once or twice a year.

Commissioners Joralmon, Whitehead and Myers felt the faux cactus structure surrounded by Palo Verde would be a better fit for the area than either the monument or slim line pole. Chair Miller said while the structure would be located outside the Preserve; it would disturb the vista from a nearby viewpoint, which is currently unimpeded. The Commission needs to know when the City is going to make such proposals. Mr. Ekblaw responded that the structure is not within the recommended study boundary. The City brought the matter to the MSPC because both sites were in close proximity to the Preserve.

7. North Access Area - Site Analysis

Mr. Hamilton provided an update on the North Access Area project. An RFQ was issued in July for architectural design services. From that process, Fucello and Associates was hired. Robin Rogers has been named the project manager. The design contract was approved in October and work has been done on the preliminary site analysis. This site has been much more challenging than the previous access areas. The Access Areas Report, and the Access Areas Design and Site Standards guide the project. The Report establishes the location and the classification as a major access point. The facility will feature restrooms, equestrian-related amenities, up to 200 parking spaces, gated access, indoor storage, and interpretive and regulatory signage. The Standards document was used to guide the site analysis.

Mr. Fucello said this location has some spectacular natural features. A unique aspect of this site is its topography, which is at the base of a mountain. The numerous washes there present significant drainage problems. Sites were evaluated using a suitability matrix against a series of criteria that included core preservation values, drainage, topography, viewshed, utilities, and wildlife. Each site was given a relative score. Sites A and B both scored high in access, while Site B scored much better in viewshed. These are the most costly sites at which to build. Sites C and D have decent access, with D scoring higher in preservation values.

Commissioner Carla cautioned that the eventual site not set up future ongoing problems with neighbors, such as viewshed, traffic, noise, and fear of crime. She inquired if appropriate buffering was taken into account. Mr. Fucello responded that buffering was part of the analysis and could be included in the matrix.

Mr. Filsinger spoke on behalf of the Arizona Mountaineering Club. The rock climbing community feels that the site is going to attract many people and will require 200 spaces. Use of several correctly situated parking nodes could make this goal attainable. Site A allows the best climbing access. All weather crossings on the road to secondary sites would allow climbers to get closer to the climbing crags.

Vice-Chair Myers prefers Sites C and D because they would allow the most room to expand. A common mistake in the past has been inadequate room for parking. Commissioner Whitehead also prefers Sites C and D. The lower elevations would be less visually intrusive than the higher ones. She noted that Lost Dog and Gateway received a great deal of recognition for their designs, and established a high bar for this facility.

Commissioner Klein inquired about the project timeline. Mr. Hamilton said that public input will be gathered before going to the DRB in spring. Construction is expected to start in mid to late summer, with completion in 2011. Commissioner Hubbell was mindful that visitor traffic from the Regional Park would likely increase over time. When the Maricopa Trail is built, it will likely also impact this area. Several parking areas would be a better solution than just one.

8. Planning Committee Update

Mr. Murphy noted that the City does not have the staff available for additional subcommittee meetings. Staff is prepared to present a report on the management plan to the MSPC by mid-December. It will consist of some items that originated from the Commission, and some that were added by staff. Commissioner Carla requested approval of the weed management plan. Mr. Murphy said staff is fine with the weed management plan. In response to a further inquiry from Commissioner Carla, Mr. Murphy said the City has received commercial use requests for uses that are not addressed in the MSPC document, including the request from Take-a-Hike Arizona.

Commissioner Heggli said he supports the invasive weeds management plan, but takes issue with language under "Mapping, Monitoring, and Reporting," that says the MSPC has the right to recommend corrective action to the City Council. Commissioner Carla noted that the invasive weeds and guidelines documents were acted previously by the Commission, but have not been included in the management plan.

COMMISSIONER CARLA MOVED TO INCLUDE THE INVASIVE WEEDS MANAGEMENT PLAN AND THE GUIDELINES FOR AGREEMENTS WITH VOLUNTEER ORGANIZATIONS INTO THE PRESERVE MANAGEMENT PLAN. VICE-CHAIR MYERS SECONDED. THE MOTION CARRIED BY A VOTE OF NINE (9) TO ONE (1), WITH COMMISSIONER HEGGLI DISSENTING.

Chair Miller noted that two items remained on the table, the commercial permits, which still need work, and the roles and responsibilities. Vice-Chair Myers said roles and responsibilities should wait until staff has provided their input. He proposed approving what currently exists on commercial permitting and then modifying it to address the additional needs later. Mr. Murphy noted that the document is dated 2004. Normally, when a new process is put in place, businesses in the community should be allowed to provide their input. Commissioner Carla requested staff set a time frame within which to get commercial permitting policy done, and proposed a work-study session to discuss it.

9. Promotion Committee Update and Actions

Commissioner Whitehead reported that since the Promotion Committee has not been able to meet, no new initiatives have been started. Many of the initiatives that were already in progress are awaiting implementation. The brochure on the economic benefits of conservation open space is ready to go. The Commission will have an opportunity to review it and identify a funding source to cover its printing costs. She proposed that the Promotion Committee meet at least once a quarter.

10. Change in Date for McDowell Sonoran Month

Commissioner Klein tabled this item for the next meeting.

11. Desert Discovery Center Joint Task Force Update

Commissioner Heggli reported that the consultant selection process continues. Interviews were conducted during executive session, and staff is working through the normal purchasing process. Council will consider contract approval in January.

Commissioner Whitehead queried when the Commission would have an opportunity to review the DDC Committee's recommendation and forward it to Council. Mr. Ekblaw clarified that the issue of selecting a consultant is a staff procurement process, of which Committee members were made a part. Because it involved the entire DDC Committee, it had to be handled in a public hearing. The interview process entered into executive session so as not to violate the City's procurement practices. Otherwise, consultants could have attended earlier presentations and gained an advantage for their own interviews. Neither the MSPC nor the TDC will be making recommendations on the consultant; however, they will receive information on the contract. Both Commissions will be able to make recommendations on the consulting team's report to Council.

Commissioner Whitehead noted that during the October 26 meeting of the DDC Committee, Mr. Ekblaw referred to a letter from Council authorizing its creation. She charged that such a

letter does not exist, and that authorization actually came from the Chairs of the TDC and the MSPC. The subcommittee was tasked with "acting as the core working group that will report back and make recommendations to the TDC and MSPC. Those recommendations once acted upon by the joint commissions will be the recommendations that go to Council." She requested reconfirmation that the DDC Committee still, in fact, reports to the Commissions. Commissioner Heggli responded that the DDC Committee is operating from the approved work plan, which identifies when items are to be brought before the Commissions. He added that the DDC has no authority to go in front of the Council; the Chairs of the two Commissions do.

Chair Miller inquired whether the consultant recommendation would come from Staff. Mr. Ekblaw reiterated that the majority of the selection panel consisted of staff, but since a quorum of the DDC Committee was also present, the open meeting laws had to be applied. The interviews were subsequently held in executive session to allow the interviews to adhere to the procurement procedures. Chair Miller noted that Council received a letter from the Chairs of the MSPC and the TDC, presenting a general outline of the work plan. That letter was supposed to have been reviewed by the Commissions before it was sent, but never was.

12. Review MSC Agreement with City

Chair Miller noted that the City's agreement with the McDowell Sonoran Conservancy is on Council's consent agenda for December 8. He invited comments and a recommendation from the Commission to present to Council at that meeting. The agreement surprised him since essentially none of the changes proposed by the MSPC made it in. It ended up being a simple services agreement despite the amount of work the MSPC put into it. He had hoped the agreement would lead to better cooperation with the Conservancy, but it avoids that question completely. It contains language based on a certain City structure, and he feels that the agreement should be more general than that.

He proposed minor changes to paragraphs three and four. Paragraph three indicates the duties of the City. He felt this section was problematic in that the City Council does not direct employees as the language mentions. He proposed simplifying the language to read, "the City acting through City employees, as the City Manager may direct."

In paragraph four, he proposed a similar change. Chapter 21 of the City ordinance directs that the MSPC is supposed to be involved with programs that are appropriate to the Preserve and report on how those programs are doing. The Commission cannot report on programs without first learning what is going on. The agreement does not include this at all. He proposed, at minimum, an annual review, in which the City, through its designees, would meet with the designees of the Conservancy to discuss existing Conservancy and Preserve related services.

Commissioner Carla said the agreement fails to acknowledge that other volunteer groups and volunteers are welcome also, and that the City can provide training to them. It should allow a volunteer group that wants to work in the Preserve and with the Conservancy to do so without necessarily having to be trained by the Conservancy. Pinnacle Peak Park, for example, has different types of volunteer groups, and the City provides overview training for all of them. The same thing should be possible in the Preserve.

Commissioner Carla took issue with a sentence in the background report: "The MSC acknowledges and greatly appreciates the City's Commitment to and success in land acquisition

and its oversight for the stewardship of the Preserve.” She said the City has the responsibility as well as the oversight. Commissioner Whitehead said the item is to discuss the content of the MOU. Commissioner Carla felt the changes would help staff's presentation to Council.

Commissioner Carla turned to the actual MOU itself. The section on volunteer training should indicate that whatever training is provided to volunteers who will be working on City land should be reviewed and approved by the City. Some stewards seem to lack knowledge of the depth and breadth of the history and the talent possessed by the Commissioners. The MSPC and the MSC need to work towards a partnership again. The City needs to review and approve the MSC's training of its stewards, specifically the histories. Commissioners should also be encouraged to attend the training, though that need not be in the document specifically.

Commissioner Carla said the section on Conservancy independence says that the Conservancy will go out and do other things as an independent entity. She felt the agreement should make it clear that are not representing the City of Scottsdale in their advocacy, without a specific agreement.

Commissioner Whitehead addressed the issue of the non-exclusivity of the City's relationship with the Conservancy. This agreement is a contract between the City and the Conservancy. It is independent of the City's relationship with other volunteer organizations. There is no need to reference other volunteer organizations in this contract. The appropriate place to reference other organizations would be in the draft the MSPC is working on regarding agreements with all volunteer organizations.

Commissioner Whitehead said during her review she considered seven provisions that she felt any MOU with any organization should include. Six of those provisions are included in the MSC agreement. The draft MOU makes it clear that whatever the Conservancy and its volunteers do they do under the direction of, with the guidance of, and with the authorization of the City. They are not working independently. She took issue with the first paragraph, which says, “Whereas the City of Scottsdale owns, and acting through the Preserve director or his or her designee may direct, operate, maintain certain lands designated pursuant to Article 8, Section 8 of the Charter of the City of Scottsdale.” She referred to that provision, which reads:

“To establish a mountain and desert preservation heritage for present and future citizens of the City, the Council may designate as Preserve land, any land owned by the City which is suitable for mountain or desert preservation. The Council shall designate Preserve land by resolution. Land purchased directly with the proceeds of the tax specifically authorized by the electors for purchase of Preserve land shall be deemed designated as Preserve land upon the City's acquisition.”

She noted that this provision says nothing about the operation of, maintenance of, or rules and regulations attendant to the Preserve land, once it has been acquired with elector approved tax dollars. She proposed that the first paragraph reference the Preserve Ordinance of the City Code, because that is the governing code. This modification takes into account the historic relationship between the City and the Conservancy and simply puts it in an official format. It also provides the Conservancy volunteers with the benefit of workmen's compensation, and makes the volunteers subject to the City's screening process. The document has some shortcomings, but goes a very long way towards what the Commission has wanted.

Vice-Chairman Myers agreed with the changes proposed by Chair Miller and Commissioner Whitehead. The City's structure is changing and probably will change again, so specifically designating certain people does not make a lot of sense. Changing it to refer to the City would allow staff changes to happen without affecting the agreement. He also felt that referring to the Preserve Ordinance covers what should be covered.

Commissioner Heggli said the Preserve Ordinance really has not changed. It still talks about Preserve Director liability. He sees no reason to change the wording in the MOU, because it is accurate and in agreement with the Ordinance. He felt that the modifications to paragraph four would point the Commission towards being an oversight body. The Mayor and Council have already sent the message that the MSPC are not to direct City staff. The MOU is between the City and a volunteer organization. The MOU is fine the way it stands.

Chairman Miller clarified that the MOU is an agreement between the City and the Conservancy. It has no impact on other people or organizations. Those issues must be handled in a more general form through the policy that the MSPC is trying to pull together.

Commissioner Carla inquired about the process a volunteer would go through were they express an interest in working in the Preserve. Do they work through the City, or are they directed through the Conservancy? Ms. Miller responded that they can come directly to her or to the MSC. The City still is in charge regardless of how referrals come through. Everybody is welcome, and staff oversight and training is always available no matter if MSC volunteers are on site or not. Frequently several groups are working together on the same project but City staff is always on site to provide training, tools, or any other needs that might occur. Commissioner Carla inquired whether staff reviews with stewards the procedure and history in the Preserve. Ms. Miller responded that they do.

Chairman Miller noted that concerns have been raised in the past about the way that waivers are signed. The process will have to change anyway, which will help answer some of the questions.

COMMISSIONER HEGGLI MOVED TO PASS THE MOU AS PRESENTED. COMMISSIONER KLEIN SECONDED.

**** Commissioner Silverman called for the question. Seven Commissioners agreed to close the debate.

THE MOTION FAILED BY A VOTE OF THREE (3) TO SEVEN (7), WITH CHAIR MILLER, VICE-CHAIR MYERS, AND COMMISSIONERS CARLA, HUBBELL, SILVERMAN, WHITEHEAD, AND WHEELER DISSENTING.

VICE-CHAIRMAN MYERS MOVED TO RECOMMEND THAT CITY COUNCIL MAKE THE TWO CHANGES AS OUTLINED BY CHAIRMAN MILLER, AND REMOVE THE REFERENCE TO ARTICLE 8, SECTION 8 OF THE CITY CHARTER, REPLACING IT WITH THE PRESERVE ORDINANCE AS OUTLINED BY COMMISSIONER WHITEHEAD. COMMISSIONER WHITEHEAD SECONDED.

Commissioner Joralmon suggested that Chair Miller represent the Commissioners' comments and proposed changes at the Council meeting as discussed in this meeting

THE MOTION CARRIED BY A VOTE OF SEVEN (7) TO THREE (3), WITH COMMISSIONERS HEGGLI, JORALMON, AND KLEIN DISSENTING.

Commissioner Whitehead suggested that a copy of Chapter 21 be included with the Commission's recommendation to Council, so the Council can be conversant with its details.

13. Resources for Land Acquisition

Commissioner Carla said the Commission prepared a comprehensive matrix in 1994 on available funding sources. Each option is being updated and new options added. She welcomed further suggestions and additions. The MSPC will review the matrix by February.

14. Preserve Tax Review

Chair Miller distributed account statements for the Commission's review. He noted that the Preserve tax fund tanked in the last quarter.

15. Commission's Quarterly Report to City Council

VICE-CHAIR MYERS MOVED TO ACCEPT THE COMMISSION'S QUARTERLY REPORT AND FORWARD IT TO CITY COUNCIL. COMMISSIONER HUBBELL SECONDED. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY BY A VOTE OF NINE (9) TO ZERO (0). COMMISSIONER KLEIN WAS NOT PRESENT.

16. Preserve Naming Policy

Chair Miller said the Planning Committee has been working on a policy for recognition in the Preserve. A situation has arisen that would call upon such a policy. Mayor Lane sent a letter to each Commissioner suggesting that the entryway into the Gateway be considered a City street, and that it be named after Carla.

Chair Miller invited public commentary. Mary Manross said she supports the creation of a policy on recognition in Preserve. She thanked Commissioner Carla for being the heart and soul of the Preserve since the beginning. Many people deserve praise and recognition regarding the Preserve effort, and the policy will address how those are handled in the future. The best way to start would be to for the MSPC to support Mayor Lane's request by naming the street after Carla.

Commissioner Heggli noted that the October meeting, Art DeCabooter questioned the protocol of asking the Commission to respond to questions from individual Council Members, since "they have no authority or jurisdiction to mandate anything. The Commission is an advisory body to the entire Council, and responding to one Council Member could start a firestorm." Commissioner Heggli noted that during the October meeting, Council Member Borowsky asked the MSPC two questions. The MSPC responded to one question because it was on the Council agenda, but threw out the second question because it was not. He requested clarification on

the Commission's position, since responding to the Mayor would seem inconsistent with their earlier decision.

Chair Miller invited further public commentary. Jason Rose agreed with Ms. Manross' comments. The street naming would be an honor not only for Carla, but also for the many others who have contributed to the Preserve effort. It rewards citizen involvement at its best. The Preserve happened because citizens came together to make it a reality. The Commission should enforce a general policy, but should not use it as an excuse not to act. Scottsdale should not wait for a person to pass away before honoring their contributions. That rule exists to judge a person's entire body of work, but in Carla's case, the body of work already exists.

Commissioner Wheeler felt that Council Member Borowsky's request and Mayor Lane's request were entirely different situations. The Preserve would not exist without Carla. Commissioner Whitehead inquired whether there are any legal constraints that would prevent the City from naming a street. Mr. Ekblaw said the ability to put up a street sign is within the purview of the City Council. Chair Miller said this issue could accelerate the creation of the general recognition policy. Vice Chair Myers responded that the Planning Committee has been stalled. He proposed approving this recommendation with the caveat that the MSPC develop the policy before any more recognitions are considered.

COMMISSIONER MYERS MOVED TO RECOMMEND THAT THE CITY COUNCIL NAME THE ENTRANCE ROADWAY TO THE GATEWAY CARLA WAY. PRIOR TO MOVING AHEAD WITH RECOGNITION OF OTHER DESERVING INDIVIDUALS, THE MSPC MUST PUT A GENERAL PRESERVE NAMING POLICY IN PLACE. COMMISSIONER WHEELER SECONDED.

Commissioner Hubbell said Carla should be recognized in the Preserve. Only man-made structures should be eligible for naming, and he cannot imagine anything in the new policy that would prevent this recognition from taking place.

Commissioner Heggli agreed that Carla should receive recognition. The MSPC has often received complaints about the processes they follow. Currently there is no naming policy, and he felt recognition at this time would be premature. Commissioner Klein agreed. This is the first honor in the Preserve and as such, is an important one. The Preserve is a work in progress. Fewer than half the acres within the boundary have been acquired. There are heroes yet to be named. The State has a policy of not naming anything after someone unless they have been dead for five years. There are good reasons for that. Commissioner Joralmon noted a difference between naming geographical features and naming infrastructure. There is precedent for naming structures for people still alive. Vice Chair Myers expressed concern about the process involved, but supports the honor itself.

Commissioner Carla recused herself from the vote. She supports the creation of a general naming policy, and called for the creation of an official history of the Preserve to acknowledge all the people who contributed to it.

Chair Miller acknowledged that developing a recognition policy could easily get out of hand, and it would likely take a long time. He suggested recognizing basic criteria for a policy, but each honor should be considered individually. The policy should not be too detailed.

COMMISSIONER KLEIN MOVED TO HAVE THE TWO PORTIONS OF VICE-CHAIR MYERS' MOTION CONSIDERED SEPARATELY. COMMISSIONER HEGGLI SECONDED. THE MOTION FAILED BY A VOTE OF TWO (2) TO SEVEN (7), WITH ALL DISSENTING BUT COMMISSIONERS HEGGLI AND KLEIN. COMMISSIONER CARLA ABSTAINED.

Chair Miller called for a vote on the original motion.

THE ORIGINAL MOTION CARRIED BY A VOTE OF SEVEN (7) TO TWO (2) WITH COMMISSIONERS HEGGLI AND KLEIN DISSENTING, AND COMMISSIONER CARLA ABSTAINING.

17. Future Agenda Items and Meeting Venues for 2010

Commissioner Whitehead said the MSPC should work on large group user policies to eventually add to the management plan. Chair Miller proposed agenda items on the proposed bylaw changes, and to discuss the staff report on the management plan. He proposed that the Commission receive regular updates from the Conservancy on their activities. The January 7 work-study session should be used to discuss a land acquisition strategy, and it might require an executive session. Commissioner Carla proposed a discussion on creating an ad hoc group to begin working on the history of the Preserve.

COMMISSIONER WHITEHEAD MOVED TO INCLUDE THE PROPOSED ITEMS ON THE AGENDA FOR THE JANUARY 7 MEETING. VICE-CHAIR MYERS SECONDED. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY BY A VOTE OF TEN (10) TO ZERO (0).

The Commission discussion turned to meeting venues. Commissioner Carla said she understands the need to vary locations in order to encourage broad public attendance, but said it is wrong to hold them in locations that are transit inaccessible. Eventually the Gateway should be linked to public transit, and the meetings there should draw attention to that fact. Commissioner Silverman prefers holding meetings at a regular venue. Mr. Murphy proposed the next meeting be held at Granite Reef, with other potential venues to be discussed later.

18. Preserve Director's Report

Mr. Ekblaw reported that Council has a consent agenda item related to an upcoming land auction. He also noted that the City is awaiting a draft on Trust land reform from the Governor's Office. Commissioner Carla suggested assembling a small group to review the draft when it becomes available and identify its strengths and weaknesses. The MSPC and Scottsdale will need to form a plan of action.

Mr. Ekblaw said the City is negotiating potential donations of land within the RSB. One would be a conservation easement, while the other two would be dedications in deed. Commissioner Whitehead expressed concern that a conservation easement could interfere with accessibility. Commissioner Carla requested that staff include the pros and cons of these deals when presenting their report.

19. Operations Report

Mr. Murphy reported on the MSC's volunteer numbers for July through November. There was a weeding project on the east side of Thomson Peak Parkway last weekend, and two cactus plantings along that same corridor. Eagle Scouts helped close the horizontal mineshaft at the Paradise gold mine with a wildlife-friendly gate. The Conservancy and Scottsdale Community College volunteers helped salvage cactus. The Scottsdale Police Department held a training session at the Gateway this month. Steward class 23 was completed. Mr. Hamilton added that 38,000 trail user counts were registered from September through November 2009, representing a 115% increase over the same period last year.

20. Commissioners' Comments

Commissioner Klein proposed that Commissioners contribute money to pay for food to be served during long meetings. Chair Miller proposed the MSPC meet with the Conservancy Board in an effort to foster good relations between the groups.

21. Adjournment

With no further business to discuss, the regular meeting adjourned at 8:46 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
A/V Tronics, Inc. DBA AVTranz.

Meets established criteria.

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "William B. Murphy". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

William B. Murphy
Community Services, Executive Director